UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,713	03/31/2006	Valery Baev	175.8243USU	5783
27623 7590 05/23/2007 OHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, LLP ONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 10TH FLOOR			EXAMINER	
			HELLNER, MARK	
STAMFORD,	O, CT 06901		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3663	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	05/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/542,713	BAEV ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mark Heliner	3663				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a						
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a and will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO ute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06	March 2007.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-45 is/are pending in the approach 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-45 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and. 	rawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ ac						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list. 	nts have been received. nts have been received in A fority documents have beer au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	O (DTO 446)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application				

Application/Control Number: 10/542,713

Art Unit: 3663

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3 and 5-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al (6,570,892).

Lin et al disclose a fiber laser comprising : a fiber (130) for generating laser light having an entrance and exit side; a pumped light source (150) for generating pumped light adapted to be coupled into the fiber through an entrance side; a resonator unit (110) on one of the exit or entrance sides of the fiber for feeding back light of a given wavelength range into the fiber; a dielectric layer (air gap between the collimator 114 and the reflector 113) of variable thickness; and means (640) for displacing the reflector such that the thickness of the air gap varies.

The structure recited above reads on claim 1.

Claims 3 and 5-22 recite inherent properties of elements 130, 150, 110,114, 113 and 640.

Claims 23 – 27 read on the operation of the structure applied to claims 1, 3 and 5-27.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 28-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al in view of Fernald et al.

The difference between Lin et al and the subject matter of claims 4 and 28-45 is the use a pressure variable gaseous medium to move the reflector 113.

It is first noted that the disclosure of Lin et al provides motivation to seek out known means for displacing a reflector via the teaching of element 640.

Figures 15 and 16 of Feranald et al teach that it was well known at the time of the present application to have used a pressurized gas to motivate optical control elements.

As a result, the use of a pressurized gas to motivate the reflector of Lin et al would have been obvious.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark Hellner at telephone number 571 272 6981.

Mark Hellner

Primary Examiner

Mark Heller